6: Sugiura & Befu E-4, 5 (1951) 1962
AB6 Ainu AB6

loyalties which might result from a typical double (or bilineal) descent system were absent among the Saru Ainu.

Principal Features of the Patrilineal Descent Group

(1) *Ancestral emblem.* All men belonging to the same patrilineal group shared an ancestral emblem or crest of the same form. This emblem, known as *itokpa*, was inherited from father to son and served as the principal symbol of the group (Natori 1940: 1945: 41-51). Whether or not every member of the group had to be able to trace patrilineal descent from the founding ancestor is not clear. Although many men can still do so, this does not appear to have been required. It was rather the emblem itself which served as the concrete proof of the membership. Daughters, of course, did not inherit the emblem.

(2) *Guardian deity.* All members of a patrilineal descent group worshipped the same guardian deity, known as *pase-onkami*. The deities worshipped were the bear, owl, fox, dolphin, etc. The Ainu believed that these deities had once been protectors of their ancestors. For this reason some writers have regarded these deities as totems, but none of our data seems to support this view. There is today no clear notion among the Ainu that these animals share flesh and blood in common with their ancestors or that the animals should not be killed or eaten. The Ainu lack any totemic myth to explain the origin of the relationship between an animal and those who worship it. Also, in each family, the worship of the guardian deity was conducted by the head of the family. There were no totemic ceremonies or feasts at which all those who worshipped the same animal congregated to strengthen the solidarity of the group.

Although the ancestral crest and the guardian deity were supposed to be transmitted through both the main line and all the branch lines of a descent group, some of the branch lines, and even the main line, have at times partially modified the crest in the course of generations and have replaced the original guardian deity with another. This phenomenon suggests a mechanism of segmentation in the Ainu kinship organization, although there is no direct evidence of this.

(3) *Perpetuation of the descent line.* Patrilineal descent was normally continued from father to son. In the absence of male heirs, however, it was common for an Ainu family to have a son-in-law or a foster son inherit the emblem and worship the group's guardian deity. The father-in-law or foster father would ask the guardian deity if his son-in-law or foster son might be admitted to the patrilineal group, and, when permission was granted, he taught the novice about the ancestral emblem and the deity of the group. Since these recruits were considered full-fledged members of a patrilineal group, genealogies provided by native informants do not necessarily reflect strictly biological descent.

Immigrants to a village and servants whom the Ainu considered good men might also be given the right to share the emblem of the descent group of the village, worship its deity, and thus be incor-

6: Sugiura & Befu E-4, 5 (1951) 1962
AB6 Ainu AB6

porated into the group. Such a newcomer gave "man's treasure" (*ekashi korpe*)—the nature of which is not clear—and other objects as compensation at his initiation ceremony. It is said that there used to be villages in which all the male residents belonged to a single descent group. A newcomer to such a village was required to abandon the emblem and deity of his original group and accept those of the new group. Some individuals, however, continued to worship their own deities even after the emblem and deity of the new group had been forced upon them.

In a marriage between a Japanese man and an Ainu woman, their son, who had no one from whom to inherit an emblem and deity, received these from one of his mother's male kinsmen. There has been a case in which three sons of a Japanese father received three different emblems and deities from three different maternal relatives. Sometimes a son born to a Japanese father and an Ainu mother was given the crest and deity of the mother's second (Ainu) husband and thus became a member of the latter's descent group.

(4) *Economic functions.* We were not able to learn whether an entire descent group or any segment of it larger than the nuclear family ever cooperated in economic activities. Nor does any property appear to have been commonly owned by either the patrilineal group as a whole or by any of its segments larger than the family. "Man's treasure," it is said, was handed down from the father to the eldest son, younger sons having to earn theirs through their own effort. Some informants maintain, however, that when there were many brothers, although the eldest son was custodian of the "treasure," other sons had legitimate access to it. We have no evidence that members of a descent group owned "man's treasure" in common. In default of a son, the eldest daughter's husband or a foster son inherited this property. In an ordinary lineage system, property and status are inherited by lineage mates in genealogical order, the lineage thus serving as the basic unit of inheritance. In the Ainu kinship system, however, the family was the basic unit.

(5) *Political function in relation to the village.* It is not clear what significance the patrilineal group had as a political or legal body. One difficulty in discerning the political function of the patrilineal group is that the relationship of this kinship group to the village (*kotan*) as a territorial group is not very definite, so that the political function of one may be confused with that of the other. This is particularly true if all men in a village belonged to a single patrilineal group, as seems to have been fairly usual. In fact, older informants of the Saru River area maintain that in former times all men of a village did share the same ancestral emblem. This is probably the reason why the term for patrilineal group, *ekashi ikir*, was sometimes used to designate the village.

If the kinship group and the territorial group coincided perfectly, it may seem impossible as well as unnecessary to distinguish the functions of the two, even on theoretical grounds. However, the Ainu apparently made a distinction between the village head, *kotan-kor-kur*,

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

my informants remembered clearly, was the dog salmon ceremony; there is, however, a possibility of other rituals belonging to this category. His main function seems to have been religious-ritual regulation over his group. His main tasks were as the following: 1) external affairs; a) observance of rituals for affiliation of a new comer to his group (pp. 14-15), b) ritual sanction of a tresspasser, c) ritual permission to non-members to exploit resources (pp. 77-78), d) negotiation of inter-local-group affairs; 2) domestic affairs: a) leadership in observance of the dog salmon ceremony (pp. 72-73), b) being kept informed of the areas where hunting with spring bows and poisoned arrows was taking place and of the people engaged in it (p. 67), c) supervision of the proper observance of rituals and taboos by individuals of his group, d) protection of an individual family short of food, e) giving advice to individuals of his group in practical and moral difficulties which varied from production technique to medicine.

He did manual work himself, but from the above point of view he was respected and was always given an honoured position on such an occasion as the bear ceremony.

Kinship Organization of the Local Group.

This is one of the most obscure aspects of the Ainu life. Published data on the subject are scanty and fragmentary[12]. The description below is based on the data from Tokapchi and Otopuke. This aspect among the Azuma Ainu could not be ascertained; Ushintasan, the chief and competent informant from the area, died before giving sufficient information concerning the subject.

Each local group had its core which was held to be a group of male patrilineal kinsmen descended from a common male ancestor and from which the headman was usually drawn. The kin group was known as *shine ekashi ikiru*, one and the same male-ancestor descent. The overt expression of membership of this group were; the possession of a common male-ancestor mark, *ekashi itokpa* (Note 15)[13], to be engraved on *kamuinomi inau*, the offering-stick for *kamui*-deities, and the observance of common rituals for these deities. The right to perform the ritual belonged to males exclusively. An *ekashi ikiru* might be and was usually divided, each section belonging to a different local group in the same river valley as distinguished by the Ainu.

The local group often included a few males semi-adopted to the core *ekashi ikiru* group. Virilocal marriage was preferred but was not a strict rule. A man of a different *ekashi ikiru* might take up uxorilocal residence and was thus affiliated with the local group. If a male of a different *ekashi ikiru* wanted to come to live with the local group as one of its regular members, he had to marry a patrilocally residing daughter of a male of the core

ekashi ikiru so that he could obtain the right to perform the *kamuinomi* ritual associated with the ancestor mark, *ekashi itokpa*, of the core *ekashi ikiru* and he had to observe these rituals when it was necessary[14].

The transmission of *ekashi itokpa* and the associated ritual had to be performed by the headman of the daughter's father's local group. The *ekashi itokpa* newly obtained was called *matchama itokpa*, the *itokpa* of woman's side. It was the duty of the new comer to observe the ritual for deities of his wife's father's *ekashi ikiru* with the offering-sticks, *kamuinomi inau*, bearing the *matchama itokpa* on some necessary occasions. The bear ceremony was certainly one but what others were could not be identified. The new comer was thus affiliated with the local group of his wife's father but he continued to hold his own *itokpa* inherited[1] from his father and to observe the ritual associated therewith[15]. It means that he was not fully adopted to the core *ekashi ikiru* but was semi-adopted. But with his sons it was not so. The first son was affiliated with his father's *ekashi ikiru* and not with that of his mother's father; he was expected to go back to live with the local group to the core of which his father or his patrilineal male ancester belonged. All sons except the first were expected to live with the local group in which they were born, however, they might be affiliated with either of their father's *ekashi ikiru* or their mother's father's, i.e. the core *ekashi ikiru*. Which of the above *ekashi ikiru* they were to be affiliated with was determined under the direction of their headman. In case of affiliaton with their father's *ekashi ikiru* they had to inherit the *itokpa* and the associated ritual of their father as their own to "follow the ancestors of their father's side". But to live there as the regular members of the group they had also to obtain the *itokpa* of their mother's father's *ekashi ikiru* besides their own and to participate in the ritual of the group on some necessary occasions. In case of adoption into their mother's father's *ekashi ikiru*, i.e. the core *ekashi ikiru*, they inherited the *itokpa* and the associated ritual of their mother's father to "follow the ancestors of their mother's father's side", and lived with them. The senior son could also remain to live among the local group in which he was born by going through the same procedure as his father had gone through when he came to live there.

All the procedures stated above had to be followed under the direction of the headman of their local group and the transmission of the *itokpa* and the associated ritual had to be obserbed[2] by him. [622]

In some Ainu local groups there were found, besides regular members, a certain number of persons in the category of *anun utari*, foreign people. The word was prefixed with the name of the river where they stayed, e.g. *Otopuke anun utari* and so forth. By *anun utari* is meant observers of *anun kamuinomi* or non-local *kamuinomi* rituals. They fall under two classes.

1, [Errata: the word "inherited" should read "inherited". Cf. errata sheet, p. 164-B--Analyst]

2, [Errata: the word "obserbed" should read "observed"--Analyst]

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

621 formerly one *kotan* represented one *ekashi ikiru* (SUGIURA, 1951, p. 19). Again: "It (a *kotan* as social unit) has a *kotan* chief, *kotan koru kuru*. ....and its people in many cases belong to families of the same blood (*ekashi ikiru*), rarely to groups of different bloods" (IZUMI, 1951, p. 35). And: "The *kotan koru kuru* is hereditary. In some cases his family is the oldest in the *ekashi ikiru* of the *kotan*" (ibid.). For the related problem of how a newcomer is admitted into *kotan* membership, see Note 14, especially its latter part.

614 (13) A definition and examples of *ekashi itokpa* are given by KŌNO (1934).
531 Some *ekashi itokpa* bear a design held by the Ainu to represent an animal, or, more exactly, part of an animal: those given by KŌNO as actual examples show the footprint of the brown bear, that of a bird whose name is unknown
[779] and the fin of the dolphin (or grampus?) respectively (KŌNO, 1936). The fact has been noted by some writers as evidence for a survival of a totemic custom or totemism; but such a theory has not been accepted by others. The variety of the *ekashi itokpa* among the Ainu inhabitants in the Saru valley in 1939 was investigated by NATORI: the result shows a conformity of the marks among the Ainu on the upper course and a diversity among those on the lower course (NATORI, 1940; Note 8).

621 (14) Membership of local group.—Sugiura, on his survey of the Saru River
614 area, came at two conflicting sets of informants as to the membership formula
608 of the local group. According to one set "some *kotan* (local group as classified by the present writer) were formerly composed exculsively of members of the same *ekashi ikiru* group sharing the same *itokpa* (ancestral mark and *pase onkami* (ritual of some important *kamui*-spirit; properly called *kamuinomi pase onkami*) in common. When such a *kotan* admits a member of another *kotan* belonging to another *ekashi ikiru*, the person was requfred to give up his old *itokpa* and *pase onkami* for those of the new *kotan* and become a member of the *ekashi ikiru*" (SUGIURA, 1951, p. 18.). According to the other set of informants "it was thought too cruel to force the newcomer to accept the *itokpa* and *pase onkami* of the new *kotan* and renounce his hereditary *pase onkami*." (Ibid.) A case was brought to his notice in which "a male member, on adoption or marriage into another family (but not on immigration), not only received his new *itokpa* and *pase onkami* but retained his old ones as well, which he handed down to his descendants" (ibid.).

Of these two conflicting formulas SUGIURA regards the first as norm and the second as deviation. He remarks: "It might be assumed that some of those newcomers retained their old *pase onkami* along with those of their new village (*kotan*). The result was a confusion arising between different *itokpa* and *pase onkami* which originally marked one *ekashi ikiru* from another.

The *ekashi ikiru*, instead of standing for a lineage in the strict sense of the word, tends to serve as a means of consolidating the *kotan* as a territorial group" ibid.. While stating, however, that "the male members of the *kotan* constituted one or more patrilineal kinship groups, called *ekashi ikiru*," SUGIURA makes no reference as to how an outsider might gain a membership of "a *kotan* with more than one *ekashi ikiru* groups" (ibid.). For this point we must turn to IZUMI, who worked with SUGIURA on the same survey. Resting wholly on the first set of data without touching on the second which was regarded by SUGIURA as deviation from the norm, IZUMI gives the following remarks. "Usually, members of a *kotan* consist of families of one and the same family line (*ekasni ikiru*), and rarely of more than one.... Every stranger entering the *kotan* must be reported to the chief, *kotan koru kuru*.... The chief (after much deliberation) calls a village assembly, *ukoramkoru*, to ask for general consent.... If married, the newcomers receive permission to put up a temporary shed on the *kotan keshi*, lower outskirt of the village. If unmarried, the person is taken in charge of some willing household. These people are called *tomta ek kur* (newcomer) or *iyor un kur* (hanger-on). They are not the members of the village so that they have difficulty in getting a living within the *iworu* (rendered 'arena of life' by IZUMI; p. 70 and Note 58 of the *kotan*. As a result, a bachelor will have to offer himself as servant to the household where he is staying, doing such work as is appointed by the master. A married couple have to sustain their lives by labouring in the service of the *kotan koru kuru* and some other person. At the end of a year or two the chief calls another assembly, at which, if there is no objecton, a ritual called *tomta onkami* is arranged to take the newcomer formerly into *kotan* membership. If, however, there are many objections, the person is driven out of the community.... If the newcomer is too young to know his *itokpa* family mark and *pase onkami* (*kamuiromi* ritual for some important *kamui*, or if he is marrying a girl of the *kotan* as son-in-law (*inau ramat*, heir, the person goes off his old *ekashi ikiru* and obtains new *itokpa* and *pase onkami* to become a member of the *ekashi ikiru*. This procedure is what is called *itokpa kikiraye*. If the village is composed of more than one *ekashi ikiru*, he goes into one or the other of the groups. An adopted son naturally goes into that group to which his adoptive family belongs. In all other cases it is usual for the newcomer, by means of *itokpa kikiraye*, to go into that of the household where he is staying as *iyor un kuru*. For married *tomta* who are familiar with their *ekashi ikiru*, its *itokpa* and *pase onkami*, the *itokpa kikiraye* is not so simple a procedure. If a *tomta* is thoughtful and is desirous of entering any one of the *ekashi ikiru* groups in the *kotan*, he must either entrust or contribute the best part of his treasures to the *kotan koru kuru* (if there is only one *ekashi ikiru* in the village) or to that *utaru pake*, head of

an *ekashi ikiru*, who has approved of his *itokpa kikiyare* (if there are more than one)" (IZUMI, 1951, pp. 34-35). So far as the Tokapchi and Otopuke valleys before the land allotment are concerned, there is no evidence of a village assembly to assume such political functions in the days when the headmen swayed in the traditional way. Again, in these two valleys at least, *itokpa kikiraye* did not represent a transmission of an *itokpa* with associated ritual for affiliation into a local group. Instead, it is said to have meant an exchange of *ekashi itokpa* between two persons out of peculiar interest in the history of each other's *itokpa*, though detailed circumstances for such an action are not known. When such occurred, though very rarely with justification, it is said that the procedure required full sanction and directions from the headmen concerned.

Now the first question that arises will be about the relation between *utaru pake* (head of *ekashi ikiru*) and *kotan koru kuru* (head of local group). Concerning this point IZUMI remarks: "The *kotan koru kuru* is head of the *kotan* as territorial group; in case of a *kotan* of *shine* (one) *ekashi ikiru* he is at the same time *utaru pake*, head of the kin group that forms the *kotan*. Within a *kotan* with more than one *ekashi ikiru*, so views one informant, Hachiro Kurokawa of Nuki-pet, each *ekashi ikiru* had an *utar pake* of its own, that of the most influential acting as *kotan koru kuru* as well. In contradiction to the view another informant, Kunimatsu Nitani of Niputani, informs: 'The word *utaru pake* means, not "Zoku-chō" (*head of ekashi ikiru*), but a "big man" or "old man". If you look for a word meang "Zoku-chō" the word "*utaru koru kuru*" (person who owns people) would be more appropriate. *Utaru koru kuru* in this sense would then be synonymous with *kotan koru kuru*. However, even in a *kotan* with more than one *ekashi ikiru* the presence of an *utaru koru kuru* apart from the *kotan koru kuru* has never been heard of.' More extensive investigation seems necessary before anything can be said with certainty about which of these views is correct or if either view holds good of some particular localities...." (ibid. p. 35).

Regarding this conflict of information SUGIURA makes the following remarks. "However, when more than one *ekasni ikiru* groups formed a *kotan*, did only one head and no one else represent the *kotan*?.... No evidence has been available to prove the theory that the *ekashi ikiru* formed a territorial group on the basis of the *kotan*, its chief (*utaru pake*) directing and controlling the male members sharing *shine* (one) *itokpa*. On the other hand it seems that there is not sufficient ground to deny the presence of the *utaru pake*. As far as is known today, the social life in the *kotan*, conducted chiefly on family basis, shows no sign of a strong solidarity worthy of an *ekashi ikiru*. The *pase onkami* mentioned above and the ancestor-ritual to be mentioned later are both apparently on a family level and not events for collec-

1, [Errata: the word "meang" should read "meaning". Cf. errata sheet, p. 164-A--Analyst]

tive participation of the *ekashi ikiru*. Nor are there signs of the cooperation of the *ekashi ikiru* as a whole for such economic purposes as ownership of community property or cooperation in production and distribution. The only exception is the reported presence in the field of politics of what is called '*utaru pake*'; but what the post actually was remains unknown" (SUGIURA, 1951, p. 20). At any rate, the relation between *kotan* (local group) and *ekashi ikiru* (kin group) has never been made clear, and not without reasons.

A perusal of the reports by SUGIURA and IZUMI makes one suspect that, from the difficulty of securing competent informants, they could not obtain any concrete data on the social activities of the Ainu as observed and participated in by the native informants themselves in the days before the introduction of land allotment with more or less universal redistribution in their habitation and the destruction of their traditional group life. Another important factor accountable for their failure seems to be their regarding *ekashi ikiru*, *itokpa* and *pase onkami* as mere symbols of the Ainu kin group, or as mere criteria for distinguishing one group from another. The result was an almost complete disregard of the inherent meaning and function of these instiutions.[1] The term "*ekashi ikiru*", for instance, is treated as if it were an everyday word for the patrilineal kin group of Ainu males as a mere social unit. As used by the Ainu themselves, it meant the unit group that observed *kamui nomi* rituals including *pase onkami*. Moreover, the word was exclusively for use on the occasion of, and in connection with, *kamui nomi* rituals. Again, *itokpa*, instead of being a mere family crest for showing lineage, was the very mark of ancestry to be incised on such objects as the *inau* for offering to *kamui spirits*. It also formed an essential item of the rites of *kamui nomi*. The *itokpa* and *kamuinomi* through spatial orientation of the *kamui*, maintained an inseparable connection with the habitat of the Ainu. With these rituals for cosmological adjustments, their technological adaptation to their habitat was made complete. In a sense their social organizations were means to maintain those relationships. Such, then, are some of the considerations that are prerequisite to an understanding of the Ainu groups (Chapter IV).

(15) Obtaining new *ekashi itokpa*, patrilineal ancestor mark—cases and reasons.

TAKAKURA, on historical evidence, remarks: "Though the sharing of a family mark in common was based on the fact of consanguinity, its use was sometimes extended to those not related in blood. For example, a male servant from a different area living with a family might be favourably admitted and made a sharer of the mark of the family" (Teikoku Gakushiin, ed., 1944b, p. 57).

1. [Errata: the word "instiutions" should read "institutions". Cf. errata sheet, p. 164-A--Analyst]

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

614 778 In 1939 NATORI made investigations among the living Saru river Ainu concerning the relation between the patrilineal descent, *ekashi ikiru*, and the pattern of the *ekashi itokpa*, patrilineal family mark for carving on the *inau*-offerings used in all *kamuinomi*-rituals and also on *kikeushi pashui*, the special libation-wand for rituals of some important *kamui*. His report (NATORI, 1940) contains several cases, with respective circumstances furnished, of the *ekashi itokpa* of one male line being handed down to another along with its *pase ongami* (or *onkami*) ritual for some *kamui* of special importance. The cases cited below, referring to *ekashi itokpa* engraved on the *kikeushi pashui* and not on the *inau*, will give, though vaguely, some hint and verification on the relation between the *itokpa*, the *ekashi ikiru* and the local group.

614 608 184 621

Case 1. Porosaru settlement today contains three distinct patrilineal Ainu families of long standing—those of Yukashite and Hoshipi, both originally from Tokapchi, and that of Rikizo, known to have lived in the Saru valley from time immemorial. Of the *ekashi itokpa* in use there is only one common to all, that of Rikizo handed down for generations among the Saru people (NATORI, 1940, pp. 207-208).

Case 2. Except Nukipet on the uppermost Nukapira which is tributary to the Saru, the six settlements on the upper Saru—Nioi, Shikerebe, Porosaru, Okotnai, Osatnai and Penakori—all share for the males of their old patrilineal families one *itokpa* inherited from the old Saru natives regardless of their origins (ibid., pp. 204-212).

Case 3. Onnep, grandfather of old Tekkerikin of Okotnai settlement, was of a male line of Shikoma on the Shibichari river. He was adopted by a family of a former Saru *kotan* Okotnai and inherited the *kamuinomi* of his adopted *kotan* with its *itokpa* (ibid., pp. 209-210).

Case 4. All the eight families now inhabiting Penakori settlement are of the same blood and share the same *itokpa*. When traced back along male lines, they resolve into two lineages, five related with Tadao's who descends from a headman of the former *kotan* of Penakori and three others related with old Sanouk. One of Sanouk's patrilineal ancestors came from Tokapchi, the mother of Ekoroekun, fifth on Tadao's male line, and the mother of Itomanguru, fifth on Sanouk's male line, were sisters. The relationship led Itomanguru to be adopted into Penakori settlement, making the two families sharers of one *itokpa* (ibid., p. 210).

In the above case of Penakori and those of other settlements further upstream, the new *itokpa* inherited displaced the old one, at least, on the *kikeushi pashui*; nevertheless, the *pase ongami* ritual, ritual to *kamui*-spirit of special

11: Watanabe E-4,5 (1951-1959) 1964 AB6 Ainu AB6

importance, and its worship attendant on the old *itokpa* were kept intact. On the other hand, at Niputani and other lower settlements the new *itokpa* as well as the old sometimes became composite in the carving of, at least, the *kikeushi pashui*.

Case 5. Yaibaro, ancestor of Isonoashi, an old man of Niputani, ran away from his home on the lower Saru. Arriving at the former *kotan* of Niputani, he met Pikun, who found him a promising youth and married him to a daughter of a relative, thus making him sharer of the *shine* (one) *itokpa* with himself (ibid., p. 213).

Case 6. Kenkichi, an inhabitant of Niputani, is descended by male line from Hao who came from Nioi, the former *kotan* on the upper Saru, to Niputani, the former *kotan*, on the middle reaches. His *itokpa* is a composite of the *itokpa* common in all the upper settlements including Nioi and that of Matsuji's family living in the present Niputani, descendants by male line of an inhabitant of the former Niputani *kotan* (ibid., p. 213).

Case 7. Arikate, father of Isonoashi, is a brother of Ukarikun, father of Matsuji, a descendant by male line of a member of the former *kotan* of Niputani. For certain reasons he was adopted by Pirakane, a member of Piraga, a lower Saru *kotan*. As he inherited the *kamuinomi*-ritual of his adoptive family, his *itokpa* represents a composite of his old one similar to Matsuji's and that of Pirakane's lineage (ibid., p. 214).

Case 8. Sueki is a son of Akchainu of the former *kotan* of Piratori by a Piraga girl named Chishiruye and not by his wife. He inherits the *itokpa* of his mother's father of Piraga and not his father's (ibid., p. 226).

Another report by INUKAI and NATORI gives the following as an indication of the relation between the *ekashi itokpa*, the family line, and the local group as existed among the Tokapchi Ainu.

The fifth ancestor by male line before Furukawa, Ainu resident of a Tokapchi settlement, Fushiko, came from the former *kotan* of Bebet on the Ishikari to Tokapchi, where he married a local woman and settled down. Thus Furukawa possesses two *ekashi itokpa*. One is called *Bebet un itokpa*, *itokpa* at Bebet, and is for most *kamuinomi*-rituals he observes. But the most important of all the *inau*, *pakkai inau* for supporting the bear's head in the bear festival, carries *Shupsara un itokpa*, Shupusara being the name of a former Tokapchi *kotan* near where now stands Fushiko (INUKAI and NATORI, 1940, p. 81).

(16) When Kazari, my informant from Otopuke, lived at Rucha settlement, a sister of her father, who had married into Shikaripet in Tokapchi, came